arXiv:hep-ph/0203245v1 26 Mar 2002

Mystery of Vacuum Energy or Rise and Fall of Cosmological Constant

A.D. Dolgov

INFN, Via Paradiso, 12 - 44100 Ferrara Italy

and

ITEP, Bol. Cheremushkinskaya 25, Moscow 113259, Russia.

Abstract

Two sides of cosmological constant problem are discussed: a mysterious compensation of all contributions to vacuum energy with the accuracy of 100-50 orders of magnitude and a surprising equality of a constant vacuum energy density to the present-day value of time dependent cosmological energy density.

Cosmological constant was born in 1918 in Einstein's paper [1], where he noticed that the equations of General Relativity would possess a stationary cosmological solution if one added an extra term proportional to metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ with a *constant* coefficient Λ:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = 8\pi G_N T_{\mu\nu} + g_{\mu\nu}\Lambda \tag{1}$$

For quite a long time the parameter Λ was considered as an extra degree of freedom in GR, permitted by general covariance. Now it is commonly understood that Λ should be identified with vacuum energy density:

$$\rho_{vac} = \Lambda/8\pi G_N \equiv \Lambda m_{Pl}^2/8\pi \tag{2}$$

Naively one might think that vacuum is something which is empty and thus its energy must be zero. That is why many physicists and especially astronomers were (and still are) very strongly against cosmological constant. Einstein himself considered Λ as the biggest blunder of his life. The point of view of one of the creators of the big bang

cosmology, George Gamow, is expressed by his words [2]: "λ again raises its nasty head" (he used a small letter, which somewhat reminded a snake, possibly to show his contempt). The attitude of astro-cosmo-physical society toward Λ was (and possibly is) strongly polarized. The majority did not accept the notion that vacuum might gravitate and insisted that $\Lambda \equiv 0$. On the other hand, some non-negligible by number and quality scientists believed that Λ exists and might be cosmologically important. Among them are such distinguished names as Lemaître, De Sitter, and Eddington. By Lemaître's opinion, even if Einstein did not do anything except discovering Λ-term it would be enough to make his name famous.

A striking fine-tuning, however, justified a negative attitude to a cosmologically essential Λ-term. Vacuum energy must remain constant in the course of the universe expansion, while the energy density of usual matter decreases roughly as critical energy density $\rho_c \sim m_{Pl}^2/t^2$. Thus, if *now* ρ_{vac} is close to ρ_c, it looks as a very strange coincidence. This problem stimulated the notion of the so called time dependent cosmological "constant". This idea was first put forward in 1932 by M. Bronstein [3] However this assumption is not as innocent as it sounds, and Bronstein's conjecture was justly criticized by Landau, as is admitted in Bronstein's paper [3]. Similar criticism is valid for all subsequent development of the idea; the list of publication on the subject is quite long and can be, at least partly, found in refs. [4]-[7]. In brief, the problem with $\Lambda = \Lambda(t)$ is the following. Taking covariant derivative of both sides of eq. (1), one finds:

$$\partial_\mu \Lambda + 8\pi G_N T^\nu_{\mu;\nu} = 0 \tag{3}$$

Usually the energy-momentum tensor of matter is obtained from the matter action by variation over metric:

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g}\, \mathcal{L} \tag{4}$$

and if general covariance is unbroken, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is conserved as a result of equations of motion, $T^{\nu}_{\mu;\nu} = 0$ and $\partial_\mu \Lambda = 0$. Thus a high price is to be paid for an introduction a time-dependent Λ-term: either one has to reject the standard Lagrangian formalism or to invent a new dynamical field which is a highly non-trivial task.

There is one more and even much more striking side of the cosmological constant problem. Even if vacuum energy is cosmologically significant, i.e. $\rho_{vac} \sim \rho_c$, it is unreasonably tiny in terms of particle physics scale:

$$\rho_{vac} \leq \rho_c \sim 10^{-47}\mathrm{GeV}^4 \tag{5}$$

Moreover there are contributions into vacuum energy, which are 50-100 orders of magnitude(!) larger than this upper limit. The first review papers stressing the importance of the vacuum energy problem were published in 1989 [5, 6]. Since then several more reviews appeared [7] where one can find more up-to-date references.

There are vacuum fluctuations which naively have infinitely large energy density. Fortunately in the world with equal number of bosonic and fermionic species this infinity cancels out, as was noticed by Zeldovich [8] a few years before the pioneering papers on supersymmetry were published [9]. Still since supersymmetry is not exact, only infinities are compensated but finite non-compensated remnants are of the order of the SUSY breaking scale, $\rho_{vac}^{(susy)} \sim m_{susy}^4 \geq 10^8$ GeV^4. Possibly there were phase transitions in the early universe in the course of which vacuum energy changed by 10^{60} GeV^4, if they took place at GUT scale or by 10^{10} GeV^4 at electroweak scale. One could argue however that these phase transitions are manifestations of high energy physics and who knows, if they existed or not. Still there exist some other contributions which, though smaller than the grand unification and even the electroweak ones, are enormous in comparison with $10^{-47}\,\mathrm{GeV}^4$. It is well known that vacuum state in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) is not empty. It is filled by quark (or chiral) [10] and gluon [11] condensates. The existence of these condensates is

practically an experimental fact. Successful QCD description of hadron properties is impossible without them. The vacuum energy density of the quark condensate, $\langle\bar{q}q\rangle$, is about $10^{-4}\,\mathrm{GeV}^4$ and that of gluon condensate, $\langle G^2_{\mu\nu}\rangle$, is approximately an order of magnitude bigger. Comparing these numbers with the upper bound (5) we see that there *must* exist something which does not know anything about quarks and gluons (this "something" is not related to quarks and gluons by the usual QCD interactions, otherwise it will be observed in experiment) but still this mysterious agent is able to compensate vacuum energies of quarks and gluons with the fantastic accuracy of 10^{-44}.

Several possibilities to solve this mystery were discussed in the literature, none was successful. One can imagine logically the following four ways (however, it is quite possible that a number 5 is realized):

1. Modification of gravity on macroscopic distances (possibly due to higher dimensions).
2. Anthropic principle.
3. A symmetry leading to $\rho_{vac} = 0$.
4. Adjustment mechanism (either by a new massless or very light field or due to infrared instability of quantum fluctuations in De Sitter space-time).

To modify gravity at big distances, so that the vacuum part of energy-momentum tensor does not gravitate, is a formidable task, keeping in mind that general covariance, which implies, in particular, covariant conservation of energy momentum tensor and ensures vanishing of the graviton mass, must be respected. In the course of the universe evolution equation of state may change so that vacuum energy changes (it usually happens in phase transitions) and subtraction of vacuum energy seems incompatible with conservation of total $T_{\mu\nu}$.

Anthropic principle is possibly the last resort in the case that no other solution

can be found. At the moment the situation with Λ-term reminds the one that existed in Friedman cosmology before inflationary resolution of seemingly unsolvable cosmological problems has been proposed [12].

It would be very attractive to discover a symmetry principle forbidding vacuum energy. Such a symmetry should connect known fields with new unknown ones. Some of those fields should be very light to achieve the cancellation on the scale 10^{-3} eV. Neither such fields are observed, nor such a symmetry is known. Moreover, if cosmological constant is not precisely zero, as strongly indicated by the recent data [13], one has to explain why a symmetry breaking produces a remnant very close to ρ_c today.

For me the adjustment mechanism seems to be the most promising at the present time, though this point of view is possibly not shared by many physicists working on the problem. The idea of adjustment is similar to the solution of CP-conservation problem in quantum chromodynamics by the axion field [14]-[16]. Assume that there exists a new massless field Φ coupled to gravity in such a way that this field is unstable in De Sitter background. Such a field would develop vacuum condensate whose energy could kill the source [17]. At the moment no satisfactory adjustment mechanism, which gives a realistic cosmology, has been found. However, independently of concrete realization, adjustment models generically predict that vacuum energy is compensated only up to the terms of the order of $\rho_c(t)$ [17, 4]. The non-compensated remnants may possess a rather peculiar equation of state.

A natural idea that Φ is a scalar field meets serious difficulties [5] but higher spin fields may be more perspective. In particular, a second rank symmetric tensor $S_{\mu\nu}$ with a very simple Lagrangian density:

$$\mathcal{L} = S_{\mu\nu;\alpha} S^{\mu\nu;\alpha} \tag{6}$$

could develop a condensate of isotropic components S_{tt} and $S_{ij} \sim \delta_{ij}$ which eliminate

an original ρ_{vac} down to terms of the order m_{Pl}^2/t^2 and successfully change De Sitter expansion into a power law one. Still the model does not lead to realistic cosmology. In particular, the concrete realization proposed in ref. [4] leads to a strong time variation of the gravitational constant [18]. There are quite many different models of adjustment mechanism discussed in the literature. The references can be found in the above cited reviews [7]; recently there appeared a few more papers [19].

Another model of adjustment discussed in the literature [20] is based on the known phenomenon that quantum fluctuations of massless fields in De Sitter space-time are infrared unstable. The effects of such instability are significant but it is not yet clear if they could kill their creator, vacuum energy.

An interesting approach to self-tuning of the cosmological constant in multidimensional theories is actively developed during last years. The number of papers on the subject is already impressive and constantly rising. An incomplete list of references includes the papers [21] which may help to understand some ideas showing how this mechanism may operate. One should keep in mind however, that we live in four dimensional world (higher dimensions, if they exist, are either small or penetration there is protected by a potential wall) and all the mechanisms of nullification of vacuum energy in higher dimensions must be described in 4D language as well. If new higher dimensional physics starts to operate at TeV scale it is not clear how it may cancel out QCD vacuum condensates of quarks and gluons which are developed at 100 MeV scale.

One may try another less ambitious approach - to neglect the problem of extremely large vacuum energy introduced by particle physics and quantum field theory and to try simply to describe cosmology phenomenologically introducing an additional parameter, or better to say, a function $\Lambda(t)$, keeping in mind, of course, that this can be done by introducing a new light or massless field to keep general covariance unbroken. Earlier papers on the subject include refs. [22]. This approach attracted

great attention after indications for accelerated cosmological expansion in 1998 [13]. An unknown form of energy was mimicked by a scalar field with the equation of state $p = w\rho$ with a negative parameter $w < -1/3$. The name "quintessence" was suggested for this field [23]. This work stimulated a lot of activity in the field. Many references can be found in the reviews [7]. My special pleasure is to cite in this connection the works by M. Novello and his collaborators [24].

A question of vital importance for all the models that are aimed to a resolution of vacuum energy problem is what is the magnitude of vacuum or vacuum-like energy (now the term "dark energy" is commonly used for the latter). If it is too large by absolute value, cosmology would be very much different and our type of life would be hardly possible [25] (anthropic principle?). If vacuum energy is too small it would not be observed. According to the present day data, $\Omega_{vac} \approx 0.7$. Thus we are very lucky, it is large enough to be observed in cosmological phenomena and small enough not to spoil our life. Moreover, as we have already mentioned above, this adds another interesting mystery to the list of unexplained phenomena: why ρ_{vac} which stays constant during cosmological evolution is so close to energy density of matter which evolves with cosmic time as $\rho_m \sim 1/t^2$. There is indeed weird cosmic conspiracy: all forms of matter have similar contributions to cosmological energy density: usual baryonic matter ($\Omega_b \approx 0.05$), dark matter ($\Omega_{DM} \approx 0.2 - 0.3$) - possibly dark matter consists of several components of comparable mass/energy density, and now there is another member of the club, vacuum energy with $\Omega_{vac} \approx 0.7$.

Though there are quite strong data now indicating that seemingly empty space indeed (anti)gravitates, still this conclusion is so revolutionary that it deserves more thorough checks. During practically all previous (XXth) century the overwhelming feeling was that cosmological constant is identically zero. There were only 2-3 short periods when a non-zero lambda was seriously considered. After the Einstein's "blunder" of 1918 the most serious was one at the end of 60's when astronomical

data indicated an accumulation of quasars near the red-shift $z = 2$ [26]. Then again cosmological constant was strongly out of fashion till the end of the century when different pieces of data have accumulated, all implying that Λ is most probably non-vanishing. Prior to the observation of large z supernovae [13], there were indications to the age crisis. The universe age can be expressed through the present day value of the Hubble parameter $H = 100h$ km/sec/Mpc and the cosmological energy density as:

$$t_u = 9.788 \cdot 10^9 \, h^{-1}\mathrm{yr} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1 - \Omega_{tot} + \Omega_m x^{-1} + \Omega_{rel} x^{-2} + \Omega_{vac} x^2}} \tag{7}$$

where Ω_m, Ω_{rel}, and Ω_{vac} correspond respectively to the energy density of nonrelativistic matter, relativistic matter, and to the vacuum energy density (or, what is the same, to the cosmological constant); $\Omega_{tot} = \Omega_m + \Omega_{rel} + \Omega_{vac}$. If $\Omega_{vac} = 0$, $\Omega_{tot} = 1$ (according to inflation), and $h \approx 0.7$ (see e.g. ref. [27]) then t_u would be 9.3 Gyr, much smaller than the age of the universe estimated from nuclear chronology and the ages of old globular clusters, for a recent analysis see e.g. ref. [28]. However if $\Omega_{vac} > 0$ the age crisis disappears. In particular, for $\Omega_{tot} = 1$ and $\Omega_{vac} = 0.7$ the universe age would be 13.5 Gyr in good agreement with the age determined by other methods.

Observations of high red-shift supernovae, if they are standard candles, allow to measure deceleration parameter, $q = \Omega_m - 2\Omega_{vac}$. The two contributions enter with opposite sign because positive vacuum energy antigravitates. Indeed, according to the Einstein equations effective source of gravitational force is $\rho + 3p = -2\rho$, where ρ and p are respectively energy and pressure densities and for vacuum $p = -\rho$. On the other hand, position of the first acoustic peak in the angular spectrum of cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR) permits to conclude that $\Omega_{tot} = \Omega_m + \Omega_{vac} = 1$. One can also determine Ω_m directly measuring peculiar velocities, gravitational lensing, or evolution of cluster abundances. All these methods give $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$. The determination

of three different combinations of Ω_m and Ω_{vac} mentioned above are analyzed e.g. in ref. [29] (there are many more works where a similar conclusion is reached but their list is too long for this brief paper). It is argued that all three data sets well agree converging to $\Omega_{vac} \approx 0.7$ and $\Omega_m \approx 0.3$. So it seems that now and at last astronomy presents a solid piece of evidence in favor of non-zero and significant cosmological term.

To summarize, the problem of vacuum energy remains possibly the most profound problem of contemporary physics. It is a unique example when theoretical expectation differ from observation by 100-50 orders of magnitude. The recent indications that the universe expands with acceleration and that cosmological constant (or an unknown form of dark energy) is non-vanishing significantly amplified gravity of the problem. If earlier one might think that vacuum does not gravitate at all, now it seems that empty space creates gravitational repulsion. This observation improved the status of adjustment mechanism which predicted that there must be some unusual form of energy due to a non-complete compensation of vacuum [17, 4] energy. Still no satisfactory form of adjustment mechanism leading to realistic cosmology has been yet found. Hopefully when it is achieved the theory will indicate a unique and well defined form of dark energy but at the moment the problem is far from resolution. It presents a strong challenge for fundamental research to and a serious indication to new physics. Two famous small clouds on the fundamental physics sky a century ago brought to life revolutionary quantum mechanics and relativity theory. Quite possibly the mystery of vacuum energy will stimulate new ideas in physics of this century (or millennium?).

References

[1] A. Einstein, Sitzgsber. Preuss. Acad. Wiss. **1** (1918) 142.

[2] G. Gamow, *My world line. An informal autobiography.* The Viking Press, New York, 1970.

[3] M. Bronstein, Physikalische Zeitschrift der Sowjetunion, **3** (1933) 73.

[4] A.D. Dolgov, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 5881.

[5] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989) 1.

[6] A.D. Dolgov,*Proc. of the XXIVth Rencontre de Moriond; Series: Moriond Astrophysics Meetings*, Les Arcs, France, p.227 (1989). Ed. J. Adouse and J. Tran Thanh Van.

[7] A.D. Dolgov, *Fourth Paris Cosmology Coloquium*, World Scientific, 1998, Singapore, 161. Ed. H.J. De Vega and N. Sanchez;
P. Binetruy, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 39 (2000) 1859 (lectures at Les Houches summer school 'The early Universe" and Peyresq 4 meeting, July 1999);
V. Sahni, A. Starobinsky, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D9 (2000) 373;
S. Weinberg, astro-ph/0005265; talk given at Dark Matter 2000, February, 2000;
Y. Fujii, Grav. Cosmol. 6 (2000) 107;
A. Vilenkin, hep-th/0106083, talks given at "The dark Universe" (Space Telescope Institute) and PASCOS-2001 in April 2001;
V. Sahni, astro-ph/0202076, invited review at "The Early Universe and Cosmological Observations: a Critical Review", UCT, Cape Town, July 2001;
N. Straumann, astro-ph/0203330, Invited lecture at the first *Séminaire Poincaré*, Paris, March 2002.

[8] Ya.B. Zeldovich, Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk, **95** (1968) 209.

[9] Yu.A. Golfand, E.P. Likhtman, Pis'ma ZhETF, **13** (1971) 452;
D.V. Volkov, V.P. Akulov Pis'ma ZhETF, **16** (1972) 621;
J. Wess, B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **49** (1974) 52.

[10] M. Gell Mann, R.J. Oakes, B. Renner, Phys. Rev. **175** (1968) 2195.

[11] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B147** (1978) 385.

[12] A. Guth, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 876.

[13] S. Perlmutter et al., Astrophys. J. 517 (1998) 565;
A.G. Riess et al., Astron. J. 116 (1998) 1009.

[14] R.D. Peccei, H.R. Quinn, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 1791.

[15] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40 (1978) 223.

[16] F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 40, (1978) 279.

[17] A.D. Dolgov in *The Very Early Universe*, ed. G.Gibbons, S.W.Hawking, and S.T.Tiklos (Cambridge University Press, 1982).

[18] V. A. Rubakov, P. G. Tinyakov, Phys. Rev. D61 (2000) 087503.

[19] V.A. Rubakov, Phys. Rev. D61 (2000) 061501;
A. Hebecker and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 3339.

[20] N. C. Tsamis, R. P. Woodard, Phys. Lett. B301 (1993) 351;
N. C. Tsamis, R. P. Woodard, Annals of Physics, 253, (1997) 1;
A. D. Dolgov, M. B. Einhorn, V. I. Zakharov, Phys.Rev. D52 (1995) 717;
A. D. Dolgov, M. B. Einhorn, V. I. Zakharov, Acta Phys.Polon. B26 (1995) 65;
S. Habib, C. Molina-Paris, E. Mottola, Phys.Rev. D61 (2000) 024010.

[21] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, N. Kaloper, R. Sundrum Phys.Lett. B480 (2000) 193;
S.-H. Henry Tye, I. Wasserman, Phys.Rev.Lett. 86 (2001) 1682;
P. Binetruy, J.M. Cline, C. Grojean, Phys. Lett. B489 (2000) 403;
C. Deffayet, G. Dvali, G. Gabadadze, A. Lue, Phys.Rev. D64 (2001) 104002.

[22] K. Freese, F.C. Adams, J.A. Frieman, E. Mottola, Nucl. Phys. B287 (1987) 798;
P.J.E. Peebles B. Ratra, Astrophys J., **325** (1988), L17;
B. Ratra, P.J.E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. **D37** (1988) 3406;
C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B302 (1988) 668.

[23] R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave, P.J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 1582

[24] M. Novello, J. Barcelos-Neto, J.M. Salim, hep-th/0202169;
M. Novello, J. Barcelos-Neto, J.M. Salim, hep-th/0006061.

[25] P.C.W. Davies, C. Unwin, Proc. Roy. Soc. 377 (1981) 147;
S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 (1987) 2607;
J. Garriga, A. Vilenkin, Phys.Rev. D64 (2001) 023517;
T. Banks, M. Dine, L. Motl, JHEP 0101 (2001) 031.

[26] V. Petrosian, E.E. Salpeter, P. Szekeres, Astrophys. J. 147 (1967) 1222;
I. Shklovsky, Astrophys. J. 150 (1967) L1;
M. Rowan-Robinson, MNRAS, 141 (1968) 445.

[27] W.L. Freedman, B.F. Madore, B.K. Gibson, et al, Astrophys. J., 553 (2001) 47.

[28] I. Ferreras, A. Melchiorri, J. Silk, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 327 (2001) L47;
L.M. Krauss, B. Chaboyer, astro-ph/0111597.

[29] S.L. Bridle, I. Zehavi, A. Dekel, O. Lahav, M.P. Hobson, A.N. Lasenby, astro-ph/0006170.